

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 7-10, 15-18 and 23-26 are pending. Claim 1, 9 and 17 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments. Support for the claim amendments can be found at least on page 14 (line 26) through page 15 (line 2), and page 15 (lines 8 and 15).

103 Rejections

Claims 1-2, 9-10, 17-18 and 25-26

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-2, 9-10, 17-18 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suomela (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0011467) in view of Yoshizawa (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0036273) and further in view of Spicer et al. ("Spicer;" U.S. Patent No. 7,249,188).

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Suomela nor Yoshizawa nor Spicer, nor any combination thereof, shows or suggests "a connection with a non-trusted device in said list is permitted without passkeys, wherein a level of security for a connection with any device selected from said list depends on whether said any device is designated a trusted device or a non-trusted device" as recited in independent Claim 1, "determining a level of security associated with said second connection; [and] if required by said level of security, making said second connection by automatically retrieving and using said passkey for said device from memory, wherein manual input of said passkey is obviated for said second connection and, if not required by said level of security, making said second connection without said passkey" as recited in independent Claim 9, nor "a connection with a non-trusted device in said list is permitted without passkeys,

wherein a level of security for a connection with a non-trusted device is reduced relative to a connection with a trusted device in said list" as recited in independent Claim 17.

As understood by the Applicants, Suomela only permits a user to access devices that the user has been authorized to access (please see page 4 of Suomela, toward the end of paragraph [0044]). Neither Yoshizawa nor Spicer overcomes this shortcoming. In general, and in contrast to the present claimed invention, the cited references do not make provision for a device to access both trusted and non-trusted devices, where access to a non-trusted device is made without passkeys, and where there is a relationship between the level of security and the type of device or between the level of security and the use of passkeys.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela, Yoshizawa and Spicer, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, and that these claims are allowable over the cited references.

Each of the Claims 2 and 25 includes all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 plus additional limitations. Claim 10 includes all of the limitations of independent Claim 9 plus additional limitations. Each of the Claims 18 and 26 includes all of the limitations of independent Claim 17 plus additional limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela, Yoshizawa and Spicer, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 2, 10, 18 and 25-26 in combination with the limitations of their respective base claims.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2, 10, 18 and 25-26 are in condition for allowance as depending from allowable claims.

Consequently, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 1-2, 9-10, 17-18 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 7, 15 and 23

The instant Office Action states that Claims 7, 15 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suomela in view of Yoshizawa and Spicer and further in view of Baptist et al. ("Baptist;" U.S. Patent No. 5,465,392).

Claims 7, 15 and 23 are dependent on independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, respectively, and recite additional limitations. Hence, by demonstrating that Suomela, Yoshizawa, Spicer and Baptist, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 1, 9 and 17, it is also demonstrated that these references do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 7, 15 and 23.

As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela, Yoshizawa and Spicer, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 9 and 17.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Baptist does not overcome the shortcomings of Suomela, Yoshizawa and Spicer. More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Baptist, like Suomela, Yoshizawa

and Spicer, does not make provision for a device to access both trusted and non-trusted devices, where access to a non-trusted device is made without passkeys, and where there is a relationship between the level of security and the type of device or between the level of security and the use of passkeys.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela, Yoshizawa, Spicer and Baptist, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 1, 9 and 17 cited previously herein.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that each of Claims 7, 15 and 23 is in condition for allowance as depending from an allowable claim. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 7, 15 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 8, 16 and 24

The instant Office Action states that Claims 8, 16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suomela in view of Yoshizawa and Spicer and further in view of Sormunen et al. ("Sormunen;" U.S. Patent No. 6,112,078).

Claims 8, 16 and 24 are dependent on independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, respectively, and recite additional limitations. Hence, by demonstrating that Suomela, Yoshizawa, Spicer and Sormunen, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 1, 9 and 17, it is also demonstrated that these references do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 8, 16 and 24.

As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela, Yoshizawa and Spicer, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 9 and 17.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Sormunen does not overcome the shortcomings of Suomela, Yoshizawa and Spicer. More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Sormunen, like Suomela, Yoshizawa and Spicer, does not make provision for a device to access both trusted and non-trusted devices, where access to a non-trusted device is made without passkeys, and where there is a relationship between the level of security and the type of device or between the level of security and the use of passkeys. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela, Yoshizawa, Spicer and Sormunen, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 1, 9 and 17 cited previously herein.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that each of Claims 8, 16 and 24 is in condition for allowance as depending from an allowable claim. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 8, 16 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-2, 7-10, 15-18 and 23-26 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO HAO & BARNES LLP



William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060

Date: 11/26/07